



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

mf

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/995,151	11/27/2001	Steven L. Rohall	LOT9-2001-0008	9916

21127 7590 09/12/2006

RISSMAN JOBSE HENDRICKS & OLIVERIO, LLP
ONE STATE STREET
SUITE 800
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER

WINTER, JOHN M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3621

DATE MAILED: 09/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/995,151	Applicant(s) ROHALL ET AL.	
	Examiner John M. Winter	Art Unit 3621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _____ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3- 17, 19 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 8-11, 17, 19 and 20 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-7 and 12-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 3- 17, 19 and 20 remain pending.

Response to Arguments

The Applicants arguments filed on June 30, 2006 have been fully considered.

The amended claims are rejected in view of newly discovered reference Rohall et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0163537).

The Ahmed et al. (US Patent 6,704,772) reference has been withdrawn.

See following rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-7, 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gay, (US Patent 6,792,145) in view of Rackman (US Patent No 5,903,646), and further in view of Rohall et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0163537).

As per claim 3,

Gay ('145) discloses in a computer system operatively coupled to a network and capable of executing a communication process for sending and receiving electronic mail documents, a method comprising:

storing the shadow document in a computer usable memory.(Figure 2)

Gay ('145) does not explicitly disclose creating a shadow document from an original document; identifying one of a parent and child document of the original document and storing a reference thereto in the shadow document. Rackman ('646) discloses creating a shadow document from an original document;(Column 8, lines 15-17; figure 4A) identifying one of a parent and child document of the original document and storing a reference thereto in the shadow document,(Column 8, lines 47-52). It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Gay ('145) method with the Rackman ('646) in order to create a redundant data archive so that the document could be retrieved in the event of primary system failing.

Gay ('145) does not explicitly disclose "parsing the original document for selected logistical data comprising any of sender, receiver, original size, subject, date, carbon copies of the original document. Rohall et al. ('537) discloses Parsing the original document for selected logistical data comprising any of sender, receiver, original size, subject, date, carbon copies of

Art Unit: 3621

the original document, (Column 11, lines 50-67). It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Gay ('145) method with the Rohall et al. ('537) in order to provide electronic messaging to multiple users

Claim 12 is in parallel with claim 3 and is rejected for at least the same reasons.

As per claim 4,

Gay ('145) discloses the method of claim 3 wherein "A" further comprises: filtering the original document for selected content.(Figure 2)

As per claim 5,

Gay ('145) discloses the method of claim 3

Gay ('145) does not explicitly disclose wherein the shadow document further comprises selected data from the content of the original document. Rackman ('646) discloses wherein the shadow document further comprises selected data from the content of the original document. (Figure 4A). It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Gay ('145) method with the Rackman ('646) in order to create a redundant data archive using the original content so that the document could be retrieved in the event of primary system failing.

As per claim 6,

Gay ('145) discloses in a computer system operatively coupled to a network and capable of executing a communication process for sending and receiving electronic mail documents, a method comprising:

storing the shadow document in a computer usable memory.(Figure 2)

Gay ('145) does not explicitly disclose creating a shadow document from an original document upon sending of an original document by the communications process; identifying one of a parent and child document of the original document and storing a reference thereto in the shadow document. Rackman ('646) discloses creating a shadow document from an original document;(Column 8, lines 15-17; figure 4A) identifying one of a parent and child document of the original document and storing a reference thereto in the shadow document,(Column 8, lines 47-52). It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Gay ('145) method with the Rackman ('646) in order to create a redundant data archive so that the document could be retrieved in the event of primary system failing.

Claim 7 is in parallel with claim 6 and is rejected for at least the same reasons.

As per claim 13,

Gay ('145) discloses the method of claim 3 further comprising: presenting graphical representations of a plurality of documents in a manner which indicates relationships among the documents.(Figure 5)

As per claim 14,

Gay ('145) discloses the method of claim 13

Art Unit: 3621

wherein at least one of the plurality of presented documents is an original document.(Figure 5)

As per claim 15,
Gay ('145) discloses the method of claim 13
wherein at least one of the plurality of presented documents is a shadow document.(Figure 5)

As per claim 16,
Gay ('145) discloses the method of claim 1 further comprising:
resolving the reference in a shadow document to one of the parent and child document,
and maintaining in memory data identifying a plurality of shadow documents and any parent and child documents thereof.(Figure 2)

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 8-11, 17,19 and 20 are allowable over the prior art record.

Conclusion

Examiners note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Winter whose telephone number is (571) 272-6713. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30am-5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Andrew Fischer can be reached at (571) 272-6779.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Application/Control Number: 09/995,151

Page 5

Art Unit: 3621

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300 Official communications; including After Final communications labeled "Box AF"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the Examiner in the Knox Building, 50 Dulany St. Alexandria, VA.

JMW

September 5, 2006

ag Fischer 9/5/06
ANDREW FISCHER
PRIMARY EXAMINER